

REMARKS

At the time of the Office Action dated September 20, 2006, claims 1-17 were pending in this application. In this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, and 13-17 have been amended, and new claims 18-20 have been added. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate descriptive support for the amendment can be found in, for example, Figs. 2-6 and paragraphs [0047], [0050] to [0052], and [0056] to [0060] of the specification. It is noted claim 17 has further been amended to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Now, claims 1-20 are active in this application, of which claims 1, 9, and 17-20 are independent.

Claim Objections

Claim 5 has been objected to because of informalities identified by the Examiner. In response, Claim 5 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 5 is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101.

The Examiner asserts that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, claim 17 has been amended to recite “a computer storage readable medium” (emphasis shows a change).

Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, Examiner Allison’s courtesy and professionalism in conducting a telephone interview on December 18, 2006, during which how to overcome the 101 rejection was discussed. It is Applicants’ understanding that the amendment made to claim 17 will obviate the issue under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al. in view of Chang et al.

In the statement of the rejection of independent claim 1, the Examiner admitted that Nakagawa et al. does not teach a raster image processor. However, the Examiner asserted that Chang et al. teaches an information apparatus that includes a raster image processor, and concluded that it would have been obvious to have added the information apparatus of Chang et al. to the image inspection apparatus of Nakagawa et al. for converting objects and descriptions included in the content into an image form suitable for output (the first full paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action).

Applicant submits that to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Nakagawa et al. and Chang et al., either individually or in combination, do not teach a prepress system including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. Specifically, the applied combination does not teach, among other things, the following limitations:

- a controller configured to control the raster image processor, the data storage, and the plate image inspection processor, wherein

- the controller includes a parameter setting section configured to set a flow pattern of a prepress process,

- the second print image data is proofed data of the first print image data,

- the parameter setting section sets a first flow pattern of the prepress process for the first print image data and a second flow pattern of the prepress process for the second print image data, the first flow pattern including a step where the data storage stores the first raster image data obtained by the raster image processor,

the second flow pattern including a step where the plate image inspection processor executes the plate image inspection process by comparing the first and second raster image data,

upon receiving the first print image data, the controller executes the prepress process according to the first flow pattern where the controller causes the data storage to store the first raster image data, and

upon receiving the second print image data, the controller executes the prepress process according to the second flow pattern where the controller causes the plate image inspection processor to execute the plate image inspection process.

Nakagawa et al. discloses an image inspection apparatus for performing “inspection over a wide range including not only correction errors in a plate making process but errors caused in formation of an original plate film and a stage between the formation of the original plate film and completion of printing” (the abstract). Chang et al. describes an information apparatus for managing outputting of content to an output device including a communication unit for communicating with the output device (see the abstract).

However, based on Applicants’ study of these references, Neither Nakagawa et al. nor Chang et al. teaches, at a minimum, the above-mentioned newly added limitations regarding the controller, as recited in independent claim 1. By the same token, Nakagawa et al. and Chang et al. do not teach the limitations recited in independent claim 9 regarding process performed by the controller, and the limitations recited in independent claim 17 regarding the first to third programs.

Accordingly, Nakagawa et al. and Chang et al., either individually or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention in independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Dependent claims 2-8 and 10-16 are also patentably distinguishable over Nakagawa et al. and Chang et al. at least because these claims include all the limitations recited in independent claims 1 and 9. Applicants,

Application No.: 10/694,004

therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and favorable consideration thereof.

New Claims 18-20

Applicants submit that Nakagawa et al. and Chang et al., either individually or in combination, do not disclose or teach what is claimed in new claims 18-20. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

It should, therefore, be apparent that the imposed rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Tomoki Tanida

Limited Recognition No. L0098

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:TT:lnm
Facsimile: 202.756.8087

Date: December 20, 2006

WDC99 1324453-1.050063.0068

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**